



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/425,075    10/21/99    CHOULDARY

P    480.97-1- (HV) <sup>VB</sup>

EXAMINER

HM12/0327

HANA VERNY  
PETERS VERNY JONES AND BIKSA LLP  
385 SHERMAN AVENUE SUITE 6  
PALO ALTO CA 94306

HELMS, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED:

03/27/01 <sup>19</sup>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Advisory Action

Application No.

09/425,075

Applicant(s)

Choudary et al

Examiner

Larry R. Helms Ph.D.

Group Art Unit

1642



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires 18 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on 19 Mar 2001 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 3/19/01 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

- ☒ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☐ will not be entered because:
- ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The response argues that yeast are not able to express antibodies, however, the art of Horwitz produces an antibody in yeast. The response also states that the Invitrogen vectors express "regular" proteins and not antibodies. (see below)

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 1-5, 8-13, and 19-21

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other *It would have been obvious to clone the light and the heavy chains of the antibody into the Invitrogen vector and express it in yeast as it would not be undue experimentation to do this.*

SHEELA HUFF  
PRIMARY EXAMINER